LIBRARY
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
297 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

NEW CHRISTIAN

MAR.-APRIL EDITED BY KENNETH LESLIE

IT IS TIME TO DECIDE

HOWARD FAST AND THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY BUILDS A BRIDGE

A LOOK IN THE NAZI MIRROR

by Louise Harding

☆ ★ ☆

Vol. XII, No. 8 30 cents

The combination of automatic machinery and atomic power (automation plus atomation) spells in larger letters every day the necessity for the rapid development of world communal planning for production and world communal (political) responsibility for getting rid of all atomic weapons.

On the production side the need is to keep the benefits of the new powers and techniques from being cornered by private (or nationalist) interests. On the destruction side a world authority must come into being that will effectively annihilate the use of atomic power for the purposes of war. The danger is not only from large nations. West German hitlerites are today in Spain building atomic war installations. The US is arming Nato countries with atomic guided missiles.

A vast apparatus of power concentrated in the US (but largely foreign to US tradition) stands in the way of any communal solution to the very real predicament we are in. Added to that is a terrifying indifference in this part of the world which is presently suffocated with the 'benefits' of the machine age. The indifference characterizes not only so-called capitalists but the bulk of the vocal working class.

Unmaking Men: Machines make mergers make machines make mergers. In spite of anti-trust sentiment (very weak these latter days) and legislation, mergers continue to take place every day.

T. K. Quinn, former Vice-President of General Electric, writes in *The Progressive* that big company mergers are increasing every year and will control the productive apparatus of the whole country in another 20 years. The Department of Defense, he says, awarding over $2 billion in research and development contracts in 1956 gave 94% to the big corporations. Ordinarily this gives patent rights on any resulting invention to the private contractor. So the big corporations will get virtual monopoly control in the fields of electronics and atomic energy.

Little businesses steadily dwindle, absorbed by big businesses or killed off by the credit squeeze of a bankers' government. Unemployment rose last year and will rise further this year, especially if peace becomes a serious threat to our continental economy. Big Business has a job on its hands to keep the articulate and power-conscious sectors of the population contented. At the same time, barring war (and this is why they cannot bring themselves to renounce war, H-bomb or no H-bomb) they must compete with the "giant who came last," Russia, a rising industrial power whose exportable surpluses are increasingly encountered in the world market.

While business hurriedly merges here (pulling itself together, as it were, for a great struggle), in Russia it decentralizes. In this aspect of economic rationalization the US is behind the SU, and in this connection it is foolish to talk of our 'free' versus their 'controlled' economy. Our daily mergers are seldom free. One side

is free, the other usually swallowed. They are certainly not eager weddings between young lovers. The shot-gun is economic necessity.

According to Sylvia Porter in the York *Gazette and Daily* the family farmer and the small businessman are being pushed to the wall and the biggest pieces of the national income pie are shared between organized labor and Big Capital. And this leads us to wonder about organized labor, which had its own merger (AFL-CIO) and whose thinking (if any) on international affairs is warped to the Vatican-Wall Street pier. This means that the heft of American organized labor is geared with Big Capital in the irrational(but dividend-and wages-paying) Cold War Crusade with its threat of universal catastrophe.

And what of unorganized labor, Negro labor, migrant labor? Will these, like the farmer and small businessman, be the poor relations of the American economy?

And what of those (not numerous) labor unionists who oppose the Cold War Crusade? Will a domestic war be declared on them? There is plenty of evidence that the climate is being prepared for bigger battles against radical labor by which we mean honest labor.

It is in this domestic war as well as in foreign fields that the Roman Catholic political influence is being felt. And in these fields Romanism has no opposition from Protestantism. On the contrary, Protestantism has involved itself (largely through the instrumentality of the Rockefeller family and its agent J. F. Dulles) in the same Crusade and has no time for picking the bones of old quarrels with those who have put themselves at the head of the 'Christian Soldiers' and are acknowledged leaders of the 'free world'.

It must not be forgotten that Hitler was a Roman Catholic and that his advent to power was brought about by the same combination that exists in the US today, the Vatican and Big Industry. We very thoroughly documented that story in this journal *(The Protestant)* during the decade following 1938. The political clerics know their history and no doubt they have been studying in detail their Hitler venture to find out why it failed. They don't intend to fail with Ike (Dick). They have no other continent to move to. This is their last try—for a long long time anyway. They play for keeps. American industry is their Hammer of God. The AFL-CIO is the head of the hammer. That head must be solid, hard and heavy, without flaws of radicalism. Catholic Action would not go along with the ambition of right-wing Republicans to smash labor. It would rather enlist labor in the anti-Soviet Crusade. Crusading labor will receive preferred treatment, annual family wages, the 5 or 4 day week and so on. It will be thoroughly appeased and bought off. Education and the professions are to be (already have been) terrorized into acquiescence. Brain-soiling.

Of course it is not all easy going for clerical fascism in

America, and its troubles are not all behind the Iron Curtain. It has difficulties at home too. For one thing, the completely haywire extreme right-wing of the Republican Party and the unreconstructed South both complicate and obscure the picture of unity and bliss which American Fascism wishes to present to itself and to the rest of the world. Another great hole in their propaganda picture is the lack of a symbol, a human symbol, as leader of their Crusade. The best they have been able to do to date is the farm-boy grin of General Ike. How carefully they built him up, first in Europe as the great proconsul, then to double as educator, sticking him in Columbia's front window. And how he spilt the beans admitting his aversion to reading, and now spoils everything by believing the build-up, flying into a pet and interpolating words of his own into the ventriloquist's script. He has been fairly docile on the whole but it would appear that they will feel safer with Dick who never commanded armies. The advertisers know perfectly well how to sell anything if the package contains prosperity and peace. When the boom busts, then Dick may become (like Hoover) a symbol of distress. At that point look for the declaration of a national emergency and the appearance of the strong man of American Fascism. It is toward that point we would direct your attention.

It behooves the American Left to begin right now to prepare for that Day. By the American Left I do not mean the Communist Party or any of the Socialist parties. If there is no Left in America outside these parties then America is surely doomed. But these parties, each and every one, must be defended in their rights to exist, express themselves freely and carry on their constitutional operations. That portion of the American people which remains healthy and loyal to the American Constitution must organize politically to resist the creeping paralysis of Fascism that is overtaking their country. It may be necessary to form a political party. It may not be necessary, at least at first. But American health, American sanity must organize itself and bring its influence to bear upon the American political mind and body. We have in mind such men as Professors Wilson of Princeton and Emerson of Yale, Justice Douglas, Stringfellow Barr, ex-Governor Benson, Fred Stover, Robert Lynd, James Brewer, Robert Brady, Abraham Pomerantz, to name just a few at random. These and men and women of like stature will be forced to come together simply as a resistance group against the Fascism that is getting too close for comfort. Its program must be broad enough to include business men like Weir and Eaton. Therefore it cannot be a socialist program. Its purpose must be to cut the thongs that bind the arms and gag the throat of democracy.

The death of the American democracy will deliver American power into the hands of a desperate fascist oligarchy which will exacerbate struggling democracies all over the world and will finally commit aggression against China and Russia. The death of

the American democracy would confront the world with the choice of two alternatives: to be ruled by the American Monopolies or to be ruled by Communist parties subservient to Russia. This is why the death of the American democracy must be prevented.

It cannot be that there are not brains and guts enough in America to save itself!

HOWARD FAST AND THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

> "I have come to believe that within the very structure and historical development of the Communist Parties, as we know them in recent years, there is an almost incurable antithesis to the socialist democracy which they name as their ultimate goal. In a struggle against fascism and colonial oppression history has shown these parties to be magnificently disciplined and courageous, but in other circumstances they fall prey to a tragic contradiction. Programatically for freedom, their very structure denies freedom within itself; and conceived as a liberating force, the monolithic power structure chokes both the democratic process and the liberating thought."
>
> —Howard Fast.

Howard Fast is one of the most widely read and admired writers in the Soviet Union. He is a brilliant and warm person and wherever his books have gone they have carried glowing humanity and liberating thought. The Russians are voracious readers and beside Fast they read Dostoievsky and Tolstoi and Dickens and Burns and Heine and the other European classics. It seems strange that a government antithetic to democracy would thus scatter the seeds of democracy among its people.

Having been on the receiving end of American Communist Party contempt and ridicule during the year when England stood alone against the Nazis and we *(The Protestant)* pleaded for help from the USA, I have first hand knowledge of the tragic contradiction to which these parties fall prey. The very slightest use of their imagination would have made them see that Britain was fighting for the whole world and that included Russia, so there was nothing tragic about their contradiction; it was just stupid. On the other hand the predicament of Israel today in the power struggle of the Middle East *is* a tragic contradiction. The sacrifice of Israel to Arab bloodlust would be a major crime. But if such a thing happens (God forbid) the greater responsibility for it would certainly rest upon the Eisenhower Doctrine and the American oil interests. For Russia has repeatedly urged that all foreign bases be evacuated in the Middle East, whereas the USA has

staked out the Middle East as an American protectorate and operates offensive bases all across Africa and into Asia Minor aimed at Russia.

Russia would never acquiesce in the destruction of Israel unless the alternative were her own destruction. If such a situation should arise what would be the choice of Howard Fast? With the death of Russia the hounds of hell would be loosed and Israel would be doomed anyway, along with every other democracy on this earth.

Perhaps the American Communist Party would have done better to have followed Browder into the limbo of an educational movement, that is, disappeared voluntarily instead of waiting to disappear involuntarily. To understand the Leninist movement on the background of Tsarism was one thing. To try to fit that movement into American life was quite another. I don't think Lenin himself would have attempted it. And there was no American Lenin. As it was, Lenin had to twist and wrench the Marxian doctrine all out of shape to make it fit the Russian situation. The Russian revolution was largely an improvization for which both Lenin and Stalin made up a Marxist accompaniment as they went along to satisfy the bibliocrats and the bibliolaters. The basic change from private to public business was the end in view. The problems of collectivizing different sectors of the economy were met as they arose, sometimes wisely and sometimes bullheadedly. The inner problem of bureaucratism was resolved first by the hard fists of the dictators and more recently by the effects of their magnificent educational program.

In another part of the statement from which the above excerpt was taken Howard Fast says that in Russia there is 'socialism without morality.' Surely he must reconsider this judgment. How can there be socialism without morality? One might almost say that socialism is morality, just as capitalism is immorality: for the end of one is service, of the other is profit. In all government by category there is bound to be an element of injustice because no single category covers two cases exactly. That is why we have a New Testament of love which overflows law. Love deals with individuals, a thing law can't do. Without the morality of law socialism would not work. Without love communism will not work. We must teach the communists love. Or will they teach it to us?

What Fast perhaps forgets (in his present pre-occupation with Soviet sin) is that Socialists have been instinctively correct in their fears that capitalist ways of life are tenacious and will not yield without a struggle to the death. And the custodians of privilege and the beneficiaries of superstition are instinctively correct in seeing their own doom in the success of socialism.

The old and the new are locked in a death struggle in which at times there can be little to admire from an ethical point of view. When the chips are down each will seek allies where it can find

them. It is fortunate for the new that it will naturally find its friends among those who seek to overturn the old (revolting colonies, for example). And the old will too often find its friends among the rats that roam the dumps of history. The lines, however, will not always be drawn as cleanly as that. Israel is a case in point. But Israel depends on the US. And the anti-Soviet Crusade is led by the US.

Moreover, if we read Anna Louise Strong's account of Soviet relations with Korea we shall discern evidences there of a new international morality, hitherto unheard of. And we may confidently predict that in the period now approaching (if peace prevails) we shall witness a vast efflorescence of this new morality. As once our missionary doctors carried the seeds of the democratic revolutions now spreading in the East, so the Soviet engineers will be at work wherever they are needed throughout the world, helping to bring an abundant life.

Of course there is an inner enemy in the proletarian revolution. It is the old lust-for-bossing. In an avowed dictatorship, no matter how rationally founded, this lust springs immediately into an ugly full bloom. Lenin hated it and fought it. So did Rakosi. But they could not control it. And its growth was cultivated by enemies of the regime. In Hungary it got out of hand. In Russia it took form in a dictatorship which is now trying hard to liquidate itself. The present plan for decentralization (a gigantic revolution) will be a potent factor in this liquidation. It will mean the beginning of a balanced distribution of political as well as economic power. Power and responsibility will be spread over 15 great regions which will complement one another and in which light and guidance will be reflected from one to the other and to the whole. (The decentralization will also make Russia less vulnerable to atomic aggression).

What we tend to forget, or at least to minimize, is the nature and magnitude of the enemy which Russia confronts. For actually what stares the Soviets and China in the face is Authentic Fascism, resurrected and more powerful than in the Berlin-Tokyo Axis, including as it does the former enemies of that Axis, heeding this time much more attentively ecclesiastical guidance, with billions in its pocket, dominating the seven seas, with atomic and guided missile bases everywhere, *implacably determined to destroy the socialist powers.* American and Canadian liberals forget this stark fact in their day-to-day efforts to make infinitesimal repairs in a robe that is being ripped and torn to shreds before their eyes.

A revolutionary situation is developing because dissidence has been outlawed. What is indicated is the kind of non-violent resistance that is being used the Reverend Martin Luther King in Alabama, resistance to those who flout basic law and plan aggressive war.

Somehow we feel that Howard Fast will not finally write off the Russian Revolution.

THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY BUILDS A BRIDGE

The Very Reverend Dr. Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, has written a book called "Christians and Communism" which should be in the armoury of every anti-Cold War fighter. It is brief, simple, logical, brave, prophetic, being the fruit of his long experience on both sides of the Curtain: preaching peace in the West and observing sympathically the currents of new life in the East.

It is based on sermons preached in the Metropolitan Cathedral Church of Canterbury, the "central church of the English-speaking world," and therefore by it Dr. Johnson discharges a heavy responsibility, using such a launching platform to send forth to a very mixed-up world certain elementary truths it sorely needs.

In less than 150 pages one cannot expect too much shading or detail in the picture presented, either of Christianity or Communism. The positive features of both are outlined in order to find "points of contact across which we can build a bridge."

At the outset the Dean simply notes that Communism as expressed in the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 has changed one of the world's most backward countries into a front rank world power, a country which has done away with racial discrimination, abolished unemployment, "cut the tap-root of covetousness and paved the way for higher organization, by substituting the service motive for the profit motive as the driving force of industry," a country which concentrates on universal health and prevention of sickness and where "by 1960 every child of every nationality will remain at school till seventeen years of age."

Then he asks if there isn't something religious about this phenomenon. And to make clear what he means by religious he quotes a story told him by Prof. Hocking of Harvard which runs as follows:

"A short time ago I was talking with a colleague, a psychiatrist; he said, 'Something has been occurring to me recently which seems important, and yet it is so simple that I can hardly believe it very significant. It is a way of taking the miscellany of events which make up the day's impressions of the world. One sees no trend in them. But suppose there were a trend which we cannot define but can nevertheless have an inkling of. There is certainly some direction in evolution, why not in history? If there is such a trend, then we men can be either with it or against it. To be with it would give a certain peace and settlement; to be against it would involve a subtle inner restlessness. To have confidence in it would be a sort of commitment, for better or for worse. I wonder if that is what you mean by religion.'

" 'Yes,' I said. 'I think that is the substance of it. The great religious ones seem to have had a certainty that they were going along with the trend of the world. They have had a passion for

right living which they conceived of as a cosmic demand.'

" 'There is nothing contrary to science in that.'

" 'No, but it makes a difference, doesn't it?'

" 'Strange that such a simple thing should make so very much difference.' "*

And then the Dean goes on to say that something of that commitment met him every time he went to Russia. "It met me in all the nationalities of the Soviet Union, in Moscow, Uzbekistan, Armenia, or Georgia. It meets me now in China. It met me among all classes and in all professions. A certainty, in the Soviet Union, that Soviet Communism, and they with it, are going along with the trend of the world, coupled with a passion for right living which they conceive of as a cosmic demand, which gives them not only an elan in work but a certain peace and settlement of mind within."

This book has fifteen chapters, each a treasure chest of insight and fresh thought. The profundity of the insight may not come through to some of us because of its easy utterance. The ease, however, we suggest, is the fruit of many years' intimacy with the subject as well as much toil and travail. The Dean has been "compelled" to write this book.

His spirit and power can only be seen in his work. Here is an example of his teaching:

"In the New Testament there is no road to the heart of God save through the heart of man. 'If a man says he loves God and hates his brother he is a liar' is the theme which runs throughout the Gospels. The individual who deliberately stands alone is far from God. A society which is completely individualistic is completely irreligious no matter how many churches it builds. A society which is friendly is on the high road to loving God, though it is ignorant of the name, or denounces it because of evil associations."

"Jesus knew that it is only through the heart of all men of all nationalities that we can love God completely. Therefore in His very first sermon He attacked narrow nationalism. They nearly killed Him for that.

"It is, then, through the personal field that we get to know the love of God. And that personal field is very large. It is world-wide.

"What, then, is the groundwork of all that human personality? There must be some great reservoir of personality, some infinite and eternal ground for this limited phenomena of persons. Water never rises higher than its source. There must be some source for this widespread phenomena of persons.

"There is .

"How, we eagerly ask, can we believe in that ground? How can we know Him?

"John MacMurray makes this clear by an excellent analogy.

"Ask a scientist, he says: 'Do you believe in Matter,'

*"Christians and Communism" (p.10) published by Putnam, London.

" 'I am not interested in such an abstract question,' the scientist replies, 'but', he adds, 'I am interested, deeply interested, in bits of matter'—geologists in stones, botanists in plants, biologists in life. Very lovingly the scientist pursues his studies of these bits of matter and builds up a knowledge of, and a deep reverence for, matter as a whole. And he (the man who knows about matter) is the man who talks least about abstract matter.

"So the man who loves and seeks to weld into one loving whole the bits of personalities around him, who is always pushing further the borders of friendship of personalities, is the man who is building up in his mind a knowledge of, and a reverence for, Personality in its highest and most comprehensive form, for God. He is making the real approach to the heart of Reality."

"How now do Christianity and Communism stand in this field of human relationship, in this field of religion?

"In spite of all our faults I would suggest that we, the Christian British people, have done much for the friendship and respect between peoples and races, though badly handicapped by the ruthless quest for profits; the merchant, too frequently, undoing with one hand what the missionary did with the other. But if we had the lead at first in this field—and who can deny that Queen Victoria's colonial empire was more Christianly administered than Tsar Nicholas's Russia?—the Soviet Union has rapidly caught us up. Released from the gravely unchristian handicap of a profit-making industrial life; with service, not profit, at the heart of productive enterprise; moving towards fulfilment of Communism as defined by Marx, 'to each according to need, from each according to ability', Communism has provided a substantial moral theology for today.

"Communism has laid down ideal rules for the relations between man and man. Has declared that exploitation of one class by another class is immoral. Has declared that national wars for markets are immoral. That the oppression of subject and colonial peoples is immoral. That the unequal distribution of goods, education and leisure is immoral.

"Communism dares to take love of neighbor literally—as witness the astonishing rise, in 25 years, of Tajikistan from barbarity to high civilization.

"It places womanhood on a complete level with man.

"Here indeed are factors which make for that brotherly society, for which we are bidden to pray, as God's Kingdom on earth, and as the high road to loving Reality, loving God.

"There are, I would add in conclusion, joys in this common friendly society, knit together for a common noble task of building God's family on earth, as yet undreamed of by most of us.

"A great Oxford rowing Blue once said to a friend of mine that his favorite illustration of the Kingdom of God on earth was a racing VIII at the moment when every man was 'all out', and the boat was moving in perfect rhythm and unity. He added that

to produce such a moment at its best, the friendship of its members was an essential element. A similar example can be found when a football team 'finds itself' and plays as if a single organism were in control—plays so that every man is always where he is wanted and every pass comes to hand and every move is anticipated. Here too friendship plays its most significant part.

"In such friendship then, experienced in every field of human activity, is the road to God. Through such love of man we get to understand and reverence the Reality which gave rise to it . . .

"Open your eyes and see. Politicians may wrangle with diplomatic finesse, but the peoples are mingling beneath their gloomy, august shadows; mingling in friendship as artists, athletes, scientists, civic officers, mayors and lord mayors, farmers, doctors, students.

"It is so here.

"It is so in the United States of America where more and more Americans are saying, for example, as a group of American farmers said after the visit of Russian farmers,, 'These Russians seem like pretty good fellows, maybe we can get along with them.'

"It is so throughout the world. Men and women everywhere are learning to know and love one another and thus are marching on the high road to God."

A LOOK IN THE NAZI MIRROR

By Louise Harding

"Those who cannot remember the past,
are condemned to repeat it."

—George Santayana.

LOOKING BACKWARD.

Observing present political performancies and tendencies, your correspondent opened a tome published by the State Department, covering Documents of German Foreign Policy, 1918-45, Series D., Vol. 1, and garnered the following:

Nov. 19, 1937, on the Halifax-Hitler conversation (Eng. version).

> Halifax opened the conversation . . . The view was held in England that it was perfectly possible to clear out of the way the misunderstandings which existed at the present moment: the great services which the Chancellor had performed in the reconstruction of Germany were fully recognized; and, if the public opinion of England took up an attitude of criticism from time to time towards certain German problems, it might no doubt be in part because people in England were not fully informed of the motives and attendant circumstances of

certain measures taken in Germany . . . (but) The solution of even difficult problems could be facilitated by mutual confidence.

He, Lord Halifax, recognized that the Chancellor had not only performed great services in Germany, but also, as he would no doubt feel, had been able, by preventing the entry of Communism into his own country, to bar its passage further West."

Hitler, in his early reply, commenting on the question of disarmament . . . had moreover already found that the nations' influence was in proportion to their armaments and he saw today that his own weight in international relations had increased with the weight of his armaments . . . He pointed to his earlier proposals to prohibit bombing. Since the colonial Powers regarded the bombing aeroplane as a good method of breaking the resistance of rebellious natives, they had rejected this proposal as being against their interests . . .

Baron von Neurath said that since her withdrawal from the League Germany had never withdrawn from international co-operation whenever it appeared that there was a chance not of talking but of doing something practical. An example of this was Germany's collaboration in the *Spanish Non-Intervention question* . . .

Hitler: It was always being said that if this or that did not happen, Europe would be face to face with a catastrophe. The only catastrophe was Bolshevism. Everything else could be settled . . . It was only the part played by the press which was sinister . . . *Lord Halifax* agreed with the Chancellor's remarks as to the dangerous influence of the press.

Hitler: Anyone who, like himself, had been a soldier in the World War, wanted no more war."

(Sounds like Eisenhower).

But,

See Hitler's Top Secret talk to his Generals, Nov. 23, 1939—Struggles are different from those of 100 years ago . . . Today we fight for oil fields, rubber, treasures of the earth, etc. . . . The basic thought of Moltke was the offensive . . . Basically I did not organize the armed forces in order not to strike. The decision to strike was always in me. Earlier or later I wanted to solve the problem. . . . *Russia is at present not dangerous. It is weakened by many factors today.* . . . Five million Germans have been called to the colors. Of what importance if a few of them collapse . . .

Dec. 21, 1937, Foreign Minister Weizsacker to German Amb. to France, Welczech, reporting on conversation between Flandin (Finance Minister) and Goebbels:—

Goebbels: Russia could not be said to be a part of Europe; at any rate, as long as the Comintern was active, there was for Germany no question of negotiations with Russia.

(See U. S. State Dept. present attitude on China). He demanded cessation of the emigre press in Paris . . . Furthermore, the French Government would have to dissociate itself from the continuous attacks on Germany in newspapers like L'Humanite, Le Populaire, and L'Oeuvre.

Mch. 3, 1938, Memo by Ribbentrop, on conversation with Nevile Henderson:—the Fuehrer had further stated that in making efforts at disarmament, Soviet Russia would chiefly have to be considered . . . However, even if the Soviet Union gave its consent in principle, the question would have to be raised whether a promise of the Soviets could be trusted. Our armament was intended only as a defense against the East.

Hitler . . . the most important contribution to the re-establishment of peace and security in Europe would be *the suppression of the inflammatory international press* . . . He pointed out that he personally was known as one of the warmest friends of England, but he had been ill rewarded for this friendship.

The British Ambassador pointed out that the present British Government had considerable understanding of realities. *Chamberlain had himself assumed the leadership of the people, instead of being led by them.*

(See recent conduct of British tories).

Hitler: The limitation of armaments, therefore, depended essentially upon Soviet Russia. What was to be expected from her had again become quite clear from a speech by Voroshilov, in which the ruthless use of poison gas by Soviet armed forces was announced. Here, Germany must be armed.

(Russia did not use Poison Gas. Hitler claimed it as an excuse for his own preparations. But USA is unable to claim that Russia started the use of the Atomic and the Hydrogen Bombs).

Hitler, Agreements with Russia were as good as worthless. Soviet Russia should simply not have been allowed to enter Europe. The Fuhrer's proposals at the time had envisaged a unification of Europe without Russia.

(See the proposals of Jakob Kaiser, and Dulles, to "roll back" Russia to the Urals).

Even if the Soviet Union were today to declare its intention not to drop any more poison gas bombs, one could have no faith in such a declaration.

(These were imaginary poison-gas bombs).

Weizsacker Memo., Berlin, Feb. 28, 1938, quotes Chamberlain as saying of the Rome-Berlin Axis that it was "a pillar of European peace . . . Halifax also shared this opinion.

German Charge d'Affaires in Gt. Britain (Woermann), to German Foreign Ministry, London, Apr. 22, 1938, reports on long conversation with Under Secy. in the Foreign Office *R. A. Butler,* in the presence of Counselor of Embassy Kordt.

Mr. Butler said that he knew from close association with

Chamberlain and Lord Halifax that both, now as in the past, held fast to the idea of a real understanding with Germany, and that the events in Austria had not altered this in any way . . . In contrast with the actual intellectuals, among whom there was now as in the past a strong antipathy to the authoritarian states, the *circles close to him fully understood that Germany had to pursue her national aims in her own way.* The German and the British peoples were of the same blood—which in itself meant a bond of unity. To the circle close to him it was inconceivable that Germany and England should meet again on the battlefield.

Butler then tried discreetly to direct the conversation to Czechoslovakia, but immediately inserted the remark himself that we probably could not yet speak frankly about certain subjects. But immediately thereafter he said that England was aware that Germany would attain "her next goal." The manner in which this was done was, however, decisive for the reaction in England.

Mr. Butler . . . has always expressed his views on Germany frankly. His appointment as Parliamentary Under Secretary in the Foreign Office may therefore be regarded as a certain indication of the plans of the British Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary.

(Butler is still in office in Britain, in the Government with which Eisenhower has just been having those cozy chats.)

Memo, of German State Secy. (Dr. Missner), on reception of the Austrian State Secy. by Hitler, Nov. 19, 1936.

(Hitler) The Bolshevist *idea* is attempting to dominate the world . . . (and) I cannot face with indifference the danger of catastrophes on our neighboring countries . . . The Blum government is gradually accustoming the French to live together with Bolshevism . . . Central Europe is seriously menaced by Bolshevism, and I have been trying to convince the countries of Central Europe again and again that *we have no aggressive intentions,* but only that of warding off Bolshevism. In this connection, two problems arise, Czechoslovakia and Hungary . . .

(Later, the Nazis threw off the mask and revealed their intention of converting the rest of Europe into underlings of the Germans).

At a convocation of officials of the Fatherland Front, at Klagenfurt, Nov. 26, 1936, Federal Chancellor Schuschnigg said no acute danger threatened the movement from Communism. Schuschnigg declared, "THE PEOPLE ARE NOTHING! If I have 300 devoted officials, men like you, in every province of Austria, Austria will belong to the Fatherland Front."

But, see Memo. by the Counselor of the German Legation in Austria (Stein), Vienna, Nov. 30, 1936, stating that it was impossible to let Austria stand as an independent state, because of the danger from *Bolshevism.* "After all was said and done,

only the stand of the Fuehrer and Chancellor was a real guarantee against the spread of Communism in Austria." (See the "Ike" Resolution).

Report of von Papen, German Ambassador in Austria, to Hitler, June 1, 1937. Quotes Henderson, newly appointed British Amb. to Austria, as saying he entirely agreed with the Fuhrer that the first and greatest danger for the existence of Europe was Bolshevism, and all other viewpoints had to be subordinated to this view. Regarding the German-Austrian problem, Henderson said *he was confident his views would prevail in London.* "But please," continued the British Ambassador, "do not betray to my Vienna colleague that I entertain this opinion."

June 24, 1937, a strategic plan for the German Armed Forces was issued by the War Minister, von Blomberg. This Directive for the Uniform Preparation of the Wehrmacht for War," added that the Wehrmacht must be ready "to repel attacks at any time" and "be able to exploit militarily any favorable political opportunity that might offer itself."

(See Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression, Washington, Govt. Printing Office, 1946, Vol. VI, pgs. 1008-1011).

While even such a militarist as Charles E. Wilson, U.S. secy. of War, has stated that his analysis would indicate that the Russian build-up "has been a defensive build-up," and Gen. Gruenther, when in charge of the armed forces in Western Europe, said he saw no evidence that the Russians intended to attack, still, U.S. Reaction continues to clamor about "Defense," and even calls the War Department by that subterfuge.

Query: Having used Ike for electioneering purposes, *is it now the intention of U.S. Reaction to replace him with Nixon?*

Why Helicopters? Are They an Ominous Sign?

Considerable comment has been occasioned by the fact that the Eisenhower budget demands a couple of helicopters, to take the President and his entourage to the airport when Ike is leaving Washington. This means a considerable expense, and Drew Pearson says it means a saving of only five or six minutes.

There are numerous loud demands that this record budget be reduced. At a press conference Mch. 27, we read that Eisenhower flew into a rage when some reporter wanted to know about the helicopters: it seems the words "fatuous" and "futile" flew about.

Now, since the calls for all possible economy are certainly justified, some will want to know why the subject of Helicopters for the White House roused such wrath. But such persons are not using their thinking caps. Mr. Eisenhower well knows how the tactics of Dulles and his backers have increased, and are still increasing, the chances for War.

—*If any Bombs or Missiles are coming this way,* five minutes may be precious ones in sooth, meaning the difference between life and death.

NEW CHRISTIAN

MAR.-APRIL 1957

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, Elmsdale, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**